DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 736 CE 025 391

AUTHOR	Driscoll, Patricia; Deshler, David
TITLE	Project Energize: Outcomes of a Community Confernece on Energy Conservation.
INSTITUTION	Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y.
PUB DATE	May 80
NOTE	28p.; Appendix B will not reproduce well due to broken type.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Education; Community Services; *Conferences; *Conservation Education; Energy; *Energy Conservation; *Program Effectiveness; Solar Radiation
IDENTIFIERS	Water; Wind Energy; Wood Energy

ABSTRACT

Intended to help program planners and evaluators in providing insight as to what can be accomplished in an educational program dealing with energy conservation, this report is an evaluation of the outcomes of a community conference on energy conservation. There is a brief description of the day-long energy conference attended by 178 people (38 of whom were on the program itself) which included speeches, workshops, and group strategy sessions dealing with national energy issues: energy self sufficiency; wood/biomass; wind/water/ special applications: solar; conservation and lifestyles; and special population groups. Selected conference outcomes reported are these: (1) education was the most frequently mentioned outcome for those who attended the conference, with increased interaction being the second; (2) implementation of quick, easy, and inexpensive energy conservation measures were most often stated as personal energy conservation measures; (3) future individual plans relative to energy conservation were mainly long range, expensive projects; (4) future community group plans were mainly the continuation of those already started; and (5) suggestions for future plans were generally models with variations similar to Project Energize. Recommendations made are (1) a working model be developed for mini workshops and sponsored by two or three organizations; (2) a comprehensive energy conference be held every two years: and (3) topics should include energy issues, as well as what the individual can do. (The program schedule and evaluation summary are included as appendixes.) (MEK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186736

NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
A Statutory College of the State University
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICE STUDIES

PROJECT ENERGIZE: OUTCOMES OF A COMMUNITY CONFERENCE ON ENERGY CONSERVATION

Patricia Driscoll

David Deshler

5/80

CE 025 391

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Driscoll

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Profile of Project Energize	1
Significant Findings in Project Energize Evaluation	1
Recommendations	2
Rationale Behind Project Energize	2
Focus for Evaluation	3
Findings	5
Motivation for Attending	5
Audience	7
Present Outcomes of Project Energize	8
Outcomes for the Individual	8
Outcomes for Community Groups	11
Future Intended Outcomes of Project Energize	12
Future Changes for the Individual	13
Future Changes for the Community	13
Suggestions for Future Programs	15
Appendix A	20
Appendix B	21
Appendix C	24
References	25

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Profile of Evaluation Sample and Actual Participants of Project Energize According to Role of Participation	4
2	Range and Frequency of Motivations for Attending Project Energize	5
3	Profile of Evaluation Sample According to Individual or Group Affiliation	7
4	Range and Frequency of Outcomes of Project Energize for Individuals	8
5	Range and Frequency of Outcomes of Project Energize for Community Groups	11
6	Range and Frequency of Future Intended Outcomes of Project Energize	13
7	Range and Frequency of Inhibitors to Future Intended Outcomes	14
8	Range and Frequency of Suggestions for Future Programs	16

PROFILE OF PROJECT ENERGIZE

Project Energize was an interagency day long community education event on energy conservation at Elmira College on October 27, 1979. It was planned by the Volunteer Resource and Development Center at Elmira College, Southern Tier Central Regional Planning and Development Board, The League of Women Voters of Chemung County, The Elmira City School Community Education Program, and Cooperative Extension. In addition, other groups were involved in the planning at various stages of development.

The energy conference involved 178 people, 38 of whom were involved as planners, speakers, or discussion leaders. The design of activities included speeches, workshops, case studies, and group strategy sessions (see Appendix A, Project Energize Program, p. 20). Topics discussed included "The National Energy Picture", "The Southern Tier's Potential of Energy Self Sufficiency," Wood/Biomass; Wind/Water/Special Applications; Solar; Conservation/Lifestyles/ Transportation; Youth, Volunteer Leaders, Teachers; and Older Adults.

SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS IN PROJECT ENERGIZE EVALUATION

1. Interest in energy conservation was the most frequently cited reason for attending the conference.

2. A substantial number of people attended due to some type of affiliation with the conference. This affiliation ranged from being a planner, facilitator, speaker, or belonging to a community organization that helped sponsor it.

3. Education was the most frequently mentioned outcome for individuals who attended Project Energize. Respondents were able to cite specific facts that they learned.

4. Increased interaction was the 2nd most frequently mentioned outcome for individuals who attended and participated in Project Energize. This included interaction at the conference itself as well as continued interaction after the conference.

5. Implementation of quick, easy, and inexpensive energy conservation measures were the most frequently mentioned types of energy conservation measures reported by participants.

6. The planning process of Project Energize helped people learn planning skills that they can apply to their community organizations.

7. The apparent success of Project Energize encouraged community organizations to plan and continue their own programs on energy conservation.

8. Future plans for individuals for energy conservation measures as a result of Project Energize are mainly long range, expensive projects.

9. Future plans for community groups for energy conservation measures as a result of Project Energize are mainly the continuation of projects already started.

10. Economic factors were the most frequently cited barriers to achieving energy conservation measures.

11. Suggestions for future energy education programs consisted mainly of models with variations similar to Project Energize.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A working model should be developed for mini workshops on energy issues and conservation methods sponsored by two or three organizations, primarily for the members of those organizations. This may aid in reaching people who are not ordinarily involved, and involving them in an environment in which they are accustomed.

2. A comprehensive energy conference every 2 years.

3. Topics for the mini workshops should include energy issues, as well as what the individual can do. Practical, easy to implement measures should be emphasized, but there should be some information on more involved, long-range plans. Information on how to overcome barriers that keep people from implementing projects should also be stressed.

RATIONALE BEHIND PROJECT ENERGIZE

The objective of Project Energize according to published materials was to encourage local citizen and leadership involvement in realistic and effective planning and action on present and future energy problems. The planners reasoned that the topic of energy conservation for a conference was a timely choice as more and more people are being directly affected by the energy dilemma. They also assumed that information on how to cope would be helpful to organizational leaders as well as to invividuals.

In his lecture, "Solar Energy - A Practical Alternative" at the Phi Kappa Phi symposium - "Coping With the Energy Dilemma", Brooks Whitehurst called for

public education as a partial solution to the energy problem:

> In our governmental system, the application of alternate energy sources to our need will be greatly speeded through the education of the people about energy. Energy is a concept which is all but ignored in our schools, and the many articles written about energy in the media give the impression that understanding is possible by only a few specialists.

Charles Sullivan III in "The Energy Dilemma: Some Literary Perspectives" (also a lecture at the symposium on coping with the energy dilemma) urged the education of the public. He concludes that:

> while it is certainly necessary to come up with immediate and long range goals for coping with the energy situation, very little will actually get accomplished until a widespread and lasting crisis hits or until the general public is convinced that there is an energy dilemma - and not just an oil company plot.

Project Energize was planned by community leaders who assumed that education of the general public was feasible and an effective means of responding to the energy dilemma. A second assumption that was made by the planners was that an interagency approach was necessary. Interagency cooperation is the basis of community education.

> Community education is the process that achieves a balance and a use of all institutional forces in the education of the people - all of the people of the community (Seay, 1974).

FOCUS FOR EVALUATION

An evaluation was conducted by the planning committee at the end of the conference to provide immediate feedback on the success of Project Energize. Information obtained revealed general impressions and comments of the conference, suggestions for improvements, plans for future action based on what participants learned, and a profile of the audience. That evaluation is in Appendix B.

The purpose of this follow-up study was to expand on the evaluation conducted by the planning committee by investigating motivations for attending the conference as well as the nature and scope of conference participants' changes, if any.

Intentions for improvements were also requested. Although some of the information obtained was similar to the first evaluation, the fact that this study was conducted six months after Project Energize provides an additional basis for reliable judgments. In addition, it provided an opportunity to identify the types of changes that have actually been implemented and those that need more time for implementation.

This evaluation was a goal-free evaluation (Scriven, 1972) conducted through an ex post facto design. Goal-free evaluation is a means of ensuring that the evaluator takes into account the actual effects of education and training programs.

The interview itself was modeled after Dexter's elite and specialized interviewing technique (1970). This technique emphasises open-ended questions, in which the interviewee provides the answer based on it's relative importance, not on a predetermined selection of answers provided. As with goal free evaluation, it ensures that all possible answers are given a chance to be vocalized. The interview schedule is in Appendix C.

Of the 44 people chosen for study, 37 agreed to be interviewed. The sample was chosen as a cross section of the list of persons attending, equally representing program planners, speakers, and audience.

Table I: Profile of Evaluation Sample and Actual Participants of Project Energize According to Role of Participation.

	program planners	speaker (or in other way participated actively)	other attenders	Total
actual audience list	8	30	140	178
sample	2	7	28	37

FINDINGS

Motivation for Attending

Motivations for attending Project Energize, according to the analysis of data, included: a) interest in energy conservation; b) a role in the program; c) a desire to learn about energy conservation; and d) a response to an invitation.

Table 2: Range and Frequency of Motivations for Attending Project Energize.

Motivation	Frequency
Energy conservation nterest	24
Participant in the program	
Directly	8
Indirectly	4
Desire to learn	9
Invited by others	2

For most persons, a major motivation for participation in a program is interest in the subject matter, and Project Energize was no exception. A majority of the interviewees indicated a strong personal interest in energy conservation, as well as interest due to the fact that a community group recommended attending, interest in what they could do on the community level, and interest related to their jobs which involved them in similar programs.

A desire to learn specific or general information also was reported to motivate attendance. Of the individuals who wanted to learn information for themseleves, half "just wanted to learn more." Several individuals were interested in learning information they could use on the job. Of these, one needed specific information, the others were interested in learning more about energy conservation in general.

Another reason for attending Project Energize was involvement in the program. The interviewees who were speakers probably would not have attended if it had not been for that role. In addition, involvement in the planning committee, either

directly or indirectly was a motivation to attend, as was serving as an evaluator for a Cooperative Extension advisory board. One other reason for attending was in response to a personal invitation.

Examples of interviewee comments indicating motivation for attending Project Energize follow:

> The subject interested me. I want to learn more of what individuals can do to conserve.
>
> I think energy is a big concern for everyone. I also am a 4-H leader and was interested in what I could learn for my group.
>
> Primarily because I was a speaker there.
>
> I was visiting a friend who was involved in it, so I went, too.

Project Energize mainly attracted people who already had an interest in energy conservation and wanted to learn more. A few people who attended had specific ideas as to what they wanted to learn. A small number of people also attended not because they had an interest in the topic, but because they felt they should attend due to involvement with the planning committee or a sponoring organization.

These results may imply several things. The majority of people attended due to personal interest - these people might have sought out the information on their own if there had not been a Project Energize. What about the people who don't have an interest in the subject? Often these are the people who need the information the most. The main way they became involved was through the planning committee or association with a sponsoring group. Cosponsorship of programs by a diversity of community organizations may be an effective way to involve people who have little initial interest in energy conservation. This approach has been described by Compton (unpublished article) as participative education. Such programscombine resources of the community, centralizes programs and services, and as a consequence individuals psychologically feel that they are involved and needed.

The majority of people did not attend with a specific goal, therefore programs with a broad variety of presentations may attract more people, whereas technical workshops may attract small groups of people who want to learn specific information.

Audience

Project Energize reached a diverse audience. Although the majority of people questioned attended as individuals, a substantial number attended as representatives of an organization. Cooperative Extension was the most represented of the groups. Other groups that were represented were Southern Tier Central, League of Women Voters, Volunteer Center at Elmira College, Cornell University, Elmira College Faculty, Solar Action Council, and Southern Tier Solar Energy Association.

Tabel 3: Profile of Evaluation Sample According to Individual or Group Affiliation.

Affiliation	Frequency
Individuals	27
Cooperative Extension	
general	5
RSVP	3
4-H	2
Southern Tier Central	3
League of Women Voters	2
Volunteer Center at Elmira College	1
Cornell University	1
Elmira College Faculty	1
Solar Action Council	1
Southern Tier Solar Energy Association	1

The diversity of the audience would probably not have occured had it not been for the use of a broad variety of resources that were drawn from the many participating organizations. These resources would not have been available to

any one single sponsor. The pooling of these resources also was reported to increase the feeling of community, which is needed if people are going to work together to achieve a goal.

Project Energize did not hold the audience for the entire day. Although a substantial number did spend the whole day at the conference, the majority of the respondents left early, most of them after 4-6 hours of attendence. This may indicate that Project Energize took too long a time span for the average individual, perhaps a program similar to it should be shortened.

Present Outcomes of Project Energize

Several of the people who attended Project Energize commented about the enormous amount and variety of information that was available. This is also reflected in the diversity of tangible and intangible changes that have taken place either partly or entirely due to Project Energize, for both the individual and the community.

Outcomes for the Individual

Outcomes of Project Energize for the individual included the following broad range: a) actual energy saving changes; b) education; c) increased interaction; and d) perspective change.

Table 4: Range and Frequency of Outcomes of Project Energize for Individuals. N=37

Outcome	Frequency
energy saving change	10
education	43
increased interaction	23
perspective change	21

The most tangible changes reported were actual changes in practice or lifestyle in the area of energy conservation. The most prevalent energy conservation actions were simple ideas that could be implemented easily and inexpensively, such as dressing warmer, wrapping pipes, weatherstripping windows, checking home insulation and possible heat leakage points, storm window installation, and purchasing an energy efficient appliance.

A few people learned about and actually implemented other ideas that involved major lifestyle changes or more substantial and involved projects. such as carpooling, solar equipment installation, and woodlot management practices.

Another type of outcome that resulted from Project Energize was education. Probably the most tangible result in this area was that two term papers were written, using Project Energize as a primary source.

Project Energize appears to have fulfilled it's purpose of dissemination of information, although this is difficult to measure accurately. The majority of the interviewees who thought that Project Energize disseminated information, cited specific facts that they had learned. In addition, a few persons stated that they learned about the process of holding an energy conference simply from observing the proceedings. Several people indicated that Project Energize disseminated information about energy, and did not note any specific examples.

Increased interaction was another result of Project Energize that was reported. At the conference itself, a large, diverse audience was reached. A substantial number of people commented on this, and on the importance of getting people together to talk about the energy issue. Several people made contacts at Project Energize that have benefitted them. These contacts entailed subsequent interaction with people or organizations to get more information for their own use.

Perspective change also occured for many participants. A substantial number

of people stated that attendence at Project Energize gave them a greater awareness of energy alternatives, alternative lifestyle possibilities, and a more favorable impression of what can actually be accomplished. A general consiousness-raising about the energy picture also was stated by several people as an effect. In addition, a few people felt that Project Energize helped them to stimulate thinking about the energy dilemma and alternatives to help cope with it. The following quotations provide examples of immediate outcomes of Project Energize for the individual:

> When we went to Europe over Christmas we used a lot of the clothing ideas to keep warm with minimum clothing.
>
> My husband found out he is allergic to the cat. So, we built a solar 'greenhouse' for the cat.
>
> We sent for a kit from the electric company. It showed how to insulate the electrical inlets, and we did that. We also double checked the caulking and the tape on the windows. We put glass doors on the fireplace.
>
> I saw a lot of senior citizens at Project Energize. I think they came asking for answers, and they got answers as to what they can do to conserve.
>
> I have been reading more on the energy question.
>
> My perspective changed as to what people really can do.

Individuals who attended Project Energize cited diverse outcomes ranging from "learning more about energy" to building a solar greenhouse for the cat. Of all the respondents, only one reported no change in energy conservation attitudes or practice. Not all of the results were intended by the planning committee. People took the information and applied it to their own situations.

Many of the outcomes reported were not tangible. A few of them were major projects that have yet to be implemented. The six months time between the conference and the interviews was during the winter which did not provide optimum opportunity to engage in major projects. In spite of this, several interviewees reported plans to undertake extensive long range efforts.

However, one of the most intangible outcomes that was reported was that many people received a favorable impression of energy conservation alternatives, and were motivated to learn more.

Outcomes for Community Groups

In addition to outcomes that affect the individual, some outcomes were reported to have affected the community. These included practice changes in the organizations, increased interaction between organizations, and additional sponsored educational activities.

Table 5: Range and Frequency of Outcomes of Project Energize for Community Groups.

Outcomes	Frequency
practice changes	15
increased interaction	10
education	6

Several people indicated that they learned skills from the planning process or general organization of Project Energize that they have applied to their work. In addition, the general success of Project Energize encouraged people to continue their work in energy conservation education or to initiate programs on energy conservation in their organization.

Increased interaction also occured among community groups. Many people made contacts which they have used in their jobs, in setting up other energy education programs, and in becoming involved in and recruiting members for community groups related to energy conservation.

Other community education efforts were reported as a result of project Energize. One of these is the continued dissemination of information through videotape, written media, and incorporation of information into a lesson and

experiment on solar collectors by a science teacher. Community groups have used the general format of Project Energize also as a model in planning their own community programs on energy conservation.

Examples of community outcomes of Project Energize are provided in the following comments:

> I have used the planning skills I learned in my job.
>
> I have encouraged extension agents to have similar programs.
>
> I became involved in the planning of a solar fair.
>
> At the solar energy workshop they asked if any one wanted to join a pack to teach adults and teens about energy conservation. I joined it. We prepare packets to give to teachers so they can teach the students. We also have workshops.
>
> I tried to start a wind energy group - a sort of self help group. However, I stopped it for two reasons - lack of interest and lack of direction.
>
> I have used some of the publications in the newsletter I put out at work.
>
> My classes are building solar collectors. The students like the project, and the solar collectors work.

The changes that have taken place at the community level are also diverse. However, the responses can be catagorized within two distinct groups: 1) Skills, ideas, or contacts learned or made that have facilitated other programs; and 2) information learned has been disseminated through various media to other people who did not attend Project Energize.

Future Intended Outcomes of Project Energize

In addition to changes that have actually occured due to Project Energize, many participants indicated that they were planning changes in the future. These can be attributed at least in part to the conference. On the individual level these entail actual energy saving changes. On the community level they entail future workshops for citizens, and continuing use of planning skills.

Table 6: Range and Frequency of Future Intended Outcomes of Project Energize.

Outcome	Frequency
Individual	
energy saving changes	21
plan to go to another conference	1
seek out more information	1
Community	
initiate or continue workshops, talks, etc.	5
continue using planning skills	2
recycling program in community	1

Future Changes for the Individual

As can be expected, the majority of people have plans far into the future for their energy saving changes, and most of the changes include the planning and initiation of major projects such as an alternative energy home, solar panel installation, replacing furnace and hot water heater with more energy efficient appliances, and experimenting with water power.

Several people plan to continue their energy saving ideas in their homes, enhancing current systems with ideas and information they learned.

Future Changes for the Community

Unlike the responses for future work in energy conservation at the individual level, the majority of responses for future work at the community level are to continue working on projects that have already been started. Teaching workshops on energy and energy alternatives, training and encouraging people to provide similar programs, continuing to work with contacts made at Project Energize, and continuing use of planning skills learned are all projects that interviewees said that they will continue.

A few people indicated that they would like to become more involved in their communities at a later date.

When people actually try to implement the ideas they learn, barriers often arise. Interviewees stated barriers as being financial, cultural, and natural.

Table 7: Range and Frequency of Inhibitors to Future Intended Outcomes.

Inhibitor	Frequency
financial	11
cultural	11
natural	1

The lack of money was reported to be the biggest inhibitor in achieving individual energy saving goals. The initial investment in energy efficient technology coupled with consumer concerns about the actual cost-benefits are holding people back. The lack of money also was expressed as an inhibitor for future community programs concerning energy conservation.

In addition to financial inhibitors, cultural restrictions are a large inhibitor. Unwillingness to make a lifestyle change was reported as an inhibitor, as was the way the current home was constructed, government restrictions, and time.

Only one person cited a natural restriction--the difficulty in harnessing the water power of a nearby river.

A fair amount of people saw no inhibitors in achieving their goals of energy conservation, providing they planned carefully.

Examples of future intended outcomes of Project Energize include:

I plan to finish installing solar collectors, and a heat sink so the temperature can be regulated. Eventually I'd like to draw all my energy from solar, backed up by wind and water power.

I am thinking of installing a woodstove; also replacing the furnace and hot water heater with more energy efficient appliances.

I intend to insulate before the next heating season.

I am going to teach an energy workshop at my school and at a 4-H meeting.

I could be enticed into doing similar programs.
I would like to set up a recycling program in the city.

Of the 37 interviewees, 28 indicated plans for future work in energy conservation issues and implementations due to involvement with Project Energize.

The responses for future plans for energy conservation for the individual mainly consist of initiating new projects in their homes, whereas on the community level future plans primarily consist of the continuation of organizational projects. These changes are mainly long range, major projects. This is understandable since long range projects require more planning, expenses, and time.

Inhibitors to future intended outcomes were financial for most people, but other reasons such as lifestyle, government restrictions, time and the way the home was constructed were listed. This may suggest a possible topic for future energy conservation programs.

One noticeable pattern that appeared in informants comments on both present and future changes in energy consumption was that the majority of people seem to be substituting different forms of technology as sources of alternative energy to enable them to maintain their current style of living. Very few people reported using methods that required a bit more time, effort, and perhaps sacrifice, such as carpooling, lowering the thermostat, cooking on a woodstove, or recycling. One reason may be that people are already incorporating these ideas, or they may be unwilling to give up a lifestyle to which they have become accustomed.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS

There were many suggestions made for possible future programs on energy issues. The majority of people were satisfied with the basic organization of the program, suggesting small variations from it, such as location changes, or ideas for other information to include in future programs. Several people suggested a completely

different approach to educating the public, and a few suggested community projects that could be initiated.

Table 8: Range and Frequency of Suggestions for Future Programs.

Suggestion	Frequency
similar model with minor variations	41
different model	13
other type of project	6

A few people felt that if Project Energize were to be repeated, the only thing that should be changed would be the speakers so that new topics are included. Suggestions included obtaining speakers from all over the United States and the elimination of keynote speakers.

There were several suggestions as to the type of information that should be included. The most specific suggestions were to include information about methane, drying wastes, hydro-electric power, use of waste wood. More pros and cons about each topic was also mentioned. Other suggestions were more vague such as: a) provide different information if a future conference were held; b) provide more basic information; and c) more specific information. A few people said that more practical information would have been helpful - perhaps projects that people can actually do themselves.

A few people would like to see more workshops, with practical, hands-on experience and more small group discussions and idea-exchanging sessions on a specific topic. Another suggestion was to employ a greater variety of teaching media and methods.

There were several comments about the physical facilities and scheduling of Project Energize. A few suggested that the conference be repeated all over New York State, and perhaps all over the nation. One person suggested that it not be held at a college, but at another location where people would feel more comfortable.

Another suggested changing the location because the facilities were distracting.

A few people felt that there should have been more time allocated for speakers and for people to voice their opinions and ask questions.

One person suggested that it be expanded into a 2 or 3 day conference.

Suggestions for the frequency of the conference ranged from twice per year to once every 3-5 years.

A substantial number of people commented about the need to reach a more diverse audience. Interviewees most frequently commented that programs such as Project Energize needed to reach the general public more and that a strategy was needed to encourage the people who really need the information to come to similar programs. Usually the people who attend these programs are persons who will seek out information on their own, therefore the real need is to reach the uninformed segment of the population. Others suggested that it be focused more toward students or older adults.

One suggestion concerned the need to advertise and notify the public earlier about the conference.

Several people suggested that Project Energize incorporate more radical changes in methods that could be used to accomplish the task. One approach was to tap the mass media outlet. The use of radio, mailings, publications, advertising in the paper and television, were all mentioned as possibilities. Another approach was to have a few exhibits demonstrating one or two concepts at a place that attracts large numbers of people, as well as whole families, such as sporting events, school concerts, or fairs.

Holding mini sessions was an idea voiced by several people. These would include sessions for specific audiences, sessions on specific topics, and follow-up sessions that would expand on the information discussed at Project Energize.

Another idea involved holding mini-sessions on different topics several times a year, then holding a comprehensive conference every 3-5 years.

Conferences that let people more directly experience energy conservation also were suggested. These would include hands-on projects, demonstrations, tours of homes or projects in the area.

A few ideas were given for new projects. One was to enlist the aid of businesses in encouraging people to conserve, such as shopping centers reserving a large space for commuters to park their cars. Another was for banks and fast food businesses to suggest that people turn off their cars while waiting in drive-in lanes to be served. A still further suggestion involved a clearinghouse that would serve as a centralized location where people could get information on services that were already available; addresses of resource people and organizations, businesses that produce materials; or lists of energy conferences; and information on what people plan to accomplish or were already accomplishing.

One last suggestion concerned the formative of a political group that would have power to encourage government to give citizens some incentives to conserve, or that would give people direct information to enable them to implement energy saving ideas. The following quotes provide examples of suggestions for future programs:

> Should have one or more a year. Same general format, new information.
>
> More emphasis on research that is done that tells the whole story of the technology that is being created.
>
> If they do decide to plan another one, they should have the level of presentation different...there are many people who did not understand all of the jargon, technical information, and were looking more for basic background, basic principles, basic information.
>
> I would like to see more workshops, more hands on experience.
>
> Try to reach the people who are uninformed.
>
> I think some follow-up programs would be good. It should be the same type of information, but for specific groups, such as people in agriculture, consumer groups, older adults, small businesses. It could be accomplished in several ways - mailings, newspaper articles, publications, special programs.

Have it in a recreationally oriented setting - not at a college campus. Make it more like a family outing activity.

These energy workshops are becoming too much of a commercial enterprise, people are coming to peddle their wares. I think what is needed is to form a group with political power that will force government to give people incentive to conserve.

Overall, participants were satisfied with Project Energize. Most common suggestions included small variations from the basic program. A few ideas for other models and/or other types of projects were put forth.

The interviewees showed enthusiasm for possible future programs on energy conservation, giving constructive suggestions for improvement. Since enthusiasm was so high, it appears very possible to include these people in planning future programs. This may be an effective way to reach other community citizens and get them involved. Concern for involving certain types of unreached audiences was also expressed. One person suggested that if another conference were to be held in a more recreational setting, "to make it more like a family outing," a different type of audience might be more attracted than if it were held in an academic setting with emphasis on the pros and cons of technology. Project Energize provided not only information concerning energy conservation, but it energized a large group of citizens to be very creative in community education approaches.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Guy Burns for making it possible for me to evaluate Project Energize; Martha Fessenden for typing the report; and David Deshler for many hours of guidance in the design and execution of the evaluation as well as in the preparation of the report.

APPENDIX A

PROJECT ENERGIZE
Saturday, October 27, 1979—Elmira College Campus Center

A regional conference on energy and renewable resources, to encourage local citizen involvement and leadership in realistic and effective planning and action on present and future energy problems.

PROGRAM

8:00-8:30	Registration and Coffee
8:30-8:45	Introduction William Rider, Executive Director, Volunteer Resources Development Center, Elmira College Overview of the Day Julia Rose, Project Energize Committee
8:45-9:30	"The National Energy Picture" Emory Bauer, Corning Community College
9:30-9:50	The Southern Tier's Potential for Energy Self-Sufficiency William Dorfeld, Southern Tier Central Regional Planning and Development Board (STC) Citizen's Group
10:00-11:20	*Resource workshops** — I, II, III, IV
11:30-12:30	Lunch, Program Update D. Guy Burns, Project Energize Committee.
12:30-1:50	*Resource workshops repeat**
2:00-2:50	*Case studies*** Clara Miller, Project Energize Committee
3:00-4:20	*Group strategy sessions**** *Where Do I Go From Here?* (assignment by concerns)
4:30-5:00	Plenary Session: Feedback and summary
5:00-6:00	Social Hour: Informal exchange of ideas and demonstration
6:00-8:00	Dinner Keynote Speaker Dr. Eugene Frankel, Div. of Advanced Energy Systems Policy, Dept. of Energy, Wash., D.C.

*RESOURCE WORKSHOPS
(You will be able to attend two)

I. WOOD/BIOMASS
Moderator: Louise Fletcher

James Lassoie and Larry Walker, Cornell University
Charles and Ruth Young, Corning

II. WIND/WATER/SPECIAL APPLICATIONS
Moderator: Katherine Giacomi

Doug Banfield, Horseheads
Wesley Gunkel, Cornell University
John Neuwerk, Newark Valley
John Potter, Chemung Cooperative Extension

III. SOLAR
Moderator: Emory Bauer

Carroll Hayes, Burdett
William O'Brien, Woodhull
Dave Stipanuk, Cornell University

IV. CONSERVATION/LIFESTYLES/ TRANSPORTATION
Moderator: Virginia Houseknecht

Mary Purchase and Donald Price, Cornell University
Al and Donna White, Millerton, Pa.

**CASE STUDIES/PRESENTERS

Project Reach—Lee Beaulac
Canisteo School—Theodore Woehr
Car Pooling—James Haldeman
STC Citizens Group—Robert Kleinman
Solar Housing—Joseph Barnes

*** GROUP STRATEGY SESSIONS TASK GROUPS/FACILITATORS

Youth, Volunteer Leaders, Teachers—Kermit Bossard
Demonstration Grants—Jim Baughman
Political Action—League of Women Voters
Older Adults — Marion & Billie Voss
Home and Family—Ann Mathews

Project ENERGIZE
Evaluation Summary

APPENDIX B

60 replies

November 15, 1979

1. Workshops helpful?

	yes	no
I. Wood/Biomass	19	
II. Wind/Water	30	1
III. Solar	30	4
IV. Conservation/Lifestyles	24	

Specific workshop comments:

Wood/Biomass -

All leaders excellent - 2
Biomass interesting - more pro and con useful

Wind/Water/Special Applications -

Too technical - 3
Landscaping out of context
Tried to cover too many areas
Landscaping too short - 3

Solar -

Enjoyed Carroll Hayes especially - 2
Great educational tool
Good discussion, good speakers, excellent practical presentation - 2
Good information
Needed longer time for speaker

Conservation/Lifestyles -

Al White - "keep it radical and real" - 2
Fantastic, food for thought
Very good

General comments on workshops:

Would like to attend all four workshops, workshops too short or too many subjects in one workshop - 15
More variety
Good balance
Some workshop personnel were antagonistic and bureaucratically oriented
Need more positive useful information
More variety
Well organized
Speakers (some) didn't seem prepared, should be better trained as speakers - not all personnel informative - 3

2. Suggest changes

Timing

Start later - end earlier
Start on time - adhere to schedule better

2. Suggest changes (continued)

Site

Difficult to hear speakers in dining hall - 8
Too hot - 5
Too many lights on - 3
Slides difficult to see - 4

Miscellaneous

Provide displays from manufacturers
TV taping intrusive - 3
Too long, too intense - 2
Needed cold drinks in middle of the afternoon
Coffee ready when we arrived
Pre-conference publicity should stress urgency
More direct discussion with leaders in field - more time for questions - 2
More time to view displays
More case studies
No smoking tables appreciated - suggest no smoking at all - 3
Case studies boring, poorly organized
Registration 50¢ for teens
Could have been a 2 day session

3. Would you have preferred more or less of:

	lecture	workshop	skill development	media	other
more	4	25	24	4	*
less	9		1	1	*

* Other: Less case studies - boring, poorly organized - 2
More exhibits - 2

4. Which part of the conference was most valuable?

workshops - 36 lectures - 6 exhibits - 3 contacts - 26 task groups - 7

wood - 3
wind - 4
solar - 7
conserv - 6

literature - 1

dem. grants - 2
pol. action - 2
home & fam. - 1

5. Did the conference meet your expectations?

To a large extent - 39 To some extent - 13 Very little - 2

Comments: More stimulating than I expected, better, well balanced - 2
Exceeded expectations
Set-up format very effective

6. Now that you have participated what will you do?

Promote energy conservation measures in home - 6
Pass on information through Steuben County church people against poverty - 1
Solar - 5
Wind/Evaluation - 5
Use the wood we have - 3

5. Now that you have participated what will you do? (continued)

Am considering a passive solar house, modify existing house - 3
Develop methane system - 1
Join a group - 1
Grant proposal in progress - 2
Insulate home - 1

How may we help?

Interest legislators in learning more to keep abreast of public requirements
Provide technical help
Provide more practical local information
More consumer information
Make educational materials available to public and availability known to public - bulletins - 5
Have a program that shows and promotes actual DIY Projects (geared to conservation)
More workshops, repeat workshops - 2
Location of suppliers
Repetition of conference in 1980 - an update
Information on saws (not chain)
More technical information on figuring sizes of solar units for particular homes
Guidance for follow-up
Assistance in organizing group for wind energy advocates
Readings lists on topics covered - 2
Help with grant applications - producing a resource showing projects in this area (funding sources, experts, etc.)
Share new research information
Follow-up session to explore special interests

7. Did you attend conference as:

Individual - 38
Representative of group - 18
Job related experience - 17

8. Where did you learn about conference?

Brochures - 31
Newspaper - 9
Radio - 4
TV - 1
Word of mouth - 13
Other - 6

9.
Chemung - 18
Schuyler - 6
Steuben - 15
Yates - 2
Albany - 1
Livingston - 4
Tompkins - 4
Ontario - 2
Bradford PA - 3
Tioga PA - 3
New Jersey - 1
? - 3

10. Age Group:

0 - 18
18 - 30 - 16
30 - 45 - 15
45 - 60 - 14
60+ - 12

APPENDIX C

Interview Schedule for Outcome Evaluation Study

Name_____ Date_____ Time_____

Phone_____ Will individual participate? Y___ N___

1. Why did you attend "Project Energize"?
2. Did you participate as an individual or as a representative of a group?
3. What group:
4. Did you assume any other role in addition to being a participant such as planner, speaker, discussion leader, or provide an exhibit?
5. How long were you in attendence?

---

1. Looking back, how do you now view "Project Energize"?
2. What do you think it accomplished? Did you see any consequences, spinoffs, results, or impacts that occurred as a result of it?
3. Did you bring away any ideas or information from "Project Energize"?
4. What were those ideas?
5. Have you undertaken any action that was at least in part attributed to "Project Energize"?
6. What are some examples?
7. Do you intend to undertake any further action that was at least in part stimulated by "Project Energize"?
8. Do you anticipate any problems or inhibitors occurring in undertaking further steps of energy conservation?
9. Do you think the organizing committee should take further steps to continue program such as "Project Energize"?
10. What do you think they should do?

References

Anderson, Ball, Murphy, and Associates, Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers, 1975.

Compton, J. Lin, "A Rationale for Research on Participative Educative Programming", unpublished article.

Dexter, Louis, Elite and Specialized Interviewing, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Seay, Maurice and Associates, Community Education: A Developing Approach, Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1974.

Sullivan, Charles, "The Energy Dilemma: Some Literary Perspectives", in Coping With the Energy Dilemma, selected proceedings from a symposium sponsored by East Carolina University and Phi Kappa Phi; East Carolina University, Greenville, N.C., 1978.

Whitehurst, Brooks, "Solar Energy, A Practical Alternative", in Coping With the Energy Dilemma, selected proceedings from a symposium sponsored by East Carolina University and Phi Kappa Phi; East Carolina University, Greenville, N.C., 1978.